

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected all claims 1-31. Specifically, claims 12, 13, and 31 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, and claims 1-31 with various combinations under §103(a). In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-3, and 5-31, and has amended claim 4.

DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to because the Examiner asserts that they fail to show the "generally elliptical shape" as claimed in Claim 7. Applicant has canceled claim 7, making this drawing objection moot.

CLAIMS

Claim 4 has been rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified invention of Saghri, and in further view of Mauney. The Examiner admits that Saghri does not teach any kind of seam construction, but asserts that Mauney teaches the overlapping sidewall perimeter. The Examiner further asserts that the construction claimed in Claim 4 is well known in the art.

Applicant has amended claim 4 to include the limitations of base claim 1. Further, claim 4 has been amended to include a "substantially even curve."

Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification on page 8, lines 6-8, and in Figure 3.

The inclusion of the limitation that the upper panel and the lower panel be formed with a substantially even curve from the front portion to the back portion is distinct from all cited references. Specifically, none of the references teaches a constant curve, rather, an abrupt curve is shown in the Yonover reference (see Figure 2B). Further, Saghri does not teach a curved board shape, and instead depicts only planar boards in the Figures as well as the Specification.

The Mauney reference depicts a curved panel shape; however, this curvature is shown in Figure 2 as a lateral cross-section. A lateral cross-section is distinctly different from a curvature being formed in the longitudinal curvature of a water sports board. Specifically, the longitudinal curvature presents a more significant challenge than a shorter, cross-sectional curve in that the longer the length of the curve, the more difficult it is to form a curved panel having sufficient strength to maintain rigidity during use. Applicant's invention provides for the formation of a constant-curve longitudinal cross-section as shown in Figure 3, by varying the thread spacing in the formation of the panels. Support for this distinction is shown on page 13, line 10-13.

All remaining claims have been canceled in this Response, and thus, the rejections of these claims are moot.

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner believe that prosecution of this application might be expedited by further discussion of the issues, he is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: May 9, 2005
Gary L. Eastman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,005

GARY L. EASTMAN, ESQ.
707 Broadway Street, Suite 1800
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 230-1144
Facsimile: (619) 230-1194

Docket No.: 1188-PA03